

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION**

JIMMY LYNN POYNER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:09CV41 LMB
)	
MISSOURI BOARD OF PROBATION)	
AND PAROLE,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon the motion of Jimmy Poyner for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Upon consideration of the financial information provided with the motion, the Court finds that plaintiff is financially unable to pay any portion of the filing fee. As a result, plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Additionally, the Court has reviewed the complaint and will dismiss it pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from

such relief. An action is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis in either law or in fact.” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1974 (2007).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

The Complaint

Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”). Defendant is the Missouri Board of Probation and Parole (the “Board”). The complaint seeks monetary and injunctive relief.

Plaintiff alleges that he has diminished mental capacities as a result of a brain injury. Plaintiff further alleges that his brain disorder causes him to have seizures and other problems that require medical attention.

Plaintiff claims that he was arrested for drinking in his parked vehicle. Plaintiff claims that the arrest resulted in a conviction for driving while intoxicated (“DWI”).

As a result of plaintiff's conviction, he has been placed on probation. Plaintiff says that employees of the Board harass him and will not allow him to return to his home in Mississippi. Plaintiff claims that the actions of the Board's employees exacerbate his brain disorder and that they have made it more difficult for him to see his doctors. Plaintiff claims that their actions are discriminatory in nature because of his sexual orientation.

Discussion

Plaintiff's claim against the Board is barred by the Eleventh Amendment. See Alabama v. Pugh, 438 U.S. 781, 782 (1978). Moreover, a suit against the Board is, in effect, a suit against the State of Missouri; however, the State of Missouri is not a "person" for purposes of a § 1983 action. Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 63 (1989). As a result, the complaint fails to state a claim under § 1983.

"To state a prima facie claim under the ADA, a plaintiff must show: 1) he is a person with a disability as defined by statute; 2) he is otherwise qualified for the benefit in question; and 3) he was excluded from the benefit due to discrimination based upon disability." Randolph v. Rodgers, 170 F.3d 850, 858 (8th Cir. 1999). The facts alleged in the complaint do not show that the Board excluded plaintiff from any benefits for which he was qualified under the ADA. As a result, the complaint fails to state a claim under the ADA.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is legally frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or both.

An appropriate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 11th Day of June, 2009.

/s/ Jean C. Hamilton
JEAN C. HAMILTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE